



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

58  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/784,227	02/13/2001	Scott Craig Koss	8371-123	2514
20575	7590	04/27/2005	EXAMINER	
MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM, P.C. 1030 SW MORRISON STREET PORTLAND, OR 97205				SORRELL, ERON J
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2182		

DATE MAILED: 04/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/784,227	KOSS, SCOTT CRAIG	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Eron J. Sorrell	2182	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 February 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 13 February 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1,2,5,8,9,10,12,13, and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lahey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,217 hereinafter Lahey).

3. Referring to method claim 1 and computer-readable medium claim 9, Lahey teaches a method for network document processing, the method comprising:

a) activating an interface between a predetermined document processing device and a workstation (see lines 15-31 of column 7);

b) providing at least one user interface to a user at the workstation, wherein the interface allows the user to select

Art Unit: 2182

operational settings for the predetermined document processing device (see lines 15-31 of column 7);

c) generating a document data file (see lines 15-31 of column 7); and

d) communicating a location of the document data file and any auxiliary information to the predetermined document processing device, thereby activating a document processing job to be executed in accordance with any operational settings selected by the user (see lines 22-27 of column 6).

4. Referring to claim 2, Lahey teaches activating an interface further comprises launching a document processing client in response to a document processing request by the user (see lines 15-31 of column 7).

5. Referring to claim 5, Lahey teaches generating a document data file further comprises storing the document data file on a job file store (see lines 30-37 of column 12).

6. Referring to method claim 8 and system claim 17, Lahey teaches the document processing device is one of the group comprising: a printer, a fax machine, a multi-function peripheral, an electronic document management system, a plotter,

Art Unit: 2182

a network fax machine, a language translation server and a knowledge management system (see item labeled 31 in figure 1 and paragraph bridging columns 4 and 5).

7. Referring to claim 10, Lahey discloses an software application for print processing (see lines 15-31 of column 7). This program is fully capable of being downloaded.

8. Referring to claim 12, Lahey teaches a network document processing system, comprising:

a) a generic document processing client installed on at least one workstation connected to a network, wherein the document processing client is operable to interact with several different types of document processing devices (see lines 15-31 of column 7);

b) a job file store, operable to receive document data files generated by the document processing client (see lines 31-37 of column 12); and

c) at least one document-processing device, operable to receive a location of the document data files and auxiliary information associated with each document data file from the document-processing client (see lines 7-18 of column 5).

Art Unit: 2182

9. Referring to claim 13, Lahey teaches the document-processing client is one of the group comprised of: a printer client, a fax client, an electronic document management system client, a language translation client, and a knowledge system management client (see lines 15-31 of column 7).

10. Referring to claims 15 and 16, Lahey discloses the job file is located on another device in the network and the job file store is a dedicated device (see lines 31-37 of column 12).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 3,4, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lahey in view of Yokoyama (U.S. Patent No. 6,166,826).

Art Unit: 2182

13. Referring to claims 3 and 4, Lahey fails to teach activating an interface further comprises launching and retrieving web pages to display capabilities of the predetermined document processing device.

Yokoyama teaches, in an analogous system, activating an interface further comprises launching and retrieving web pages to display capabilities of the predetermined document processing device, wherein the user interface is a web page (see lines 29-37 of column 9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system and method of Lahey with the above teachings of Yokoyama. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to make such modification in order to be able to access the desired information with any computer with access to the internet.

14. Referring to claim 7, Lahey teaches the auxiliary information includes the operational settings specified by the user (see lines 25-27 of column 6), however Lahey fails to explicitly set forth the limitation that the auxiliary information includes the size of the file.

Art Unit: 2182

Yokoyama teaches, in an analogous system, the auxiliary information including the size of the file (see lines 20-25 of column 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system and method of Lahey with the above teachings of Yokoyama. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such modification in order to be able to select files to be printed based on the files attribute information as suggested by Yokoyama (see lines 26-37 of column 3).

15. Claims 6,11, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lahey in view of Shima (U.S. Patent No. 6,552,816).

16. Referring to claim 6, Lahey fails to teach communicating a location further comprises sending a Uniform Resource Locator to the predetermined document-processing device.

Shima teaches, in an analogous system, communicating a location further comprises sending a Uniform Resource Locator to the predetermined document-processing device (see lines 19-40 of column 5).

Art Unit: 2182

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system and method of Lahey with the above teachings of Shima. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make such modification in order for the printer to be able to print documents from any computer with access to the internet.

17. Referring to claim 11, Lahey fails to teach the computer-readable medium is a generic printer driver installed on each workstation of a network.

Shima teaches the computer-readable medium is a generic printer driver installed on each workstation of a network (see lines 37-59 of column 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the computer-readable medium of Lahey with the above teachings of Shima in order for to allow for each computer on the network to print to the network printer.

18. Referring to claim 14, Lahey fails to teach the job file store is located on the workstation upon which is installed the document processing client.

Art Unit: 2182

Shima teaches the job file store is located on the workstation upon which is installed the document processing client (see lines 37-59 of column 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system and method of Lahey with the above teachings of Shima. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to make such modification in order for documents on the workstations hard disk can be printed.

***Response to Arguments***

19. Applicant's arguments filed 9/29/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues:

1) "...the special print server then selects an appropriate printer to print the print job and transmits the printer files to the selected printer for printing. Communicating a location of a document data file and any auxiliary information to a predetermined document processing device is not the same this as a special print server selecting an appropriate printer to print a print job and transmitting the printer files to the selected printer for printing," (see paragraph bridging pages 6 and 7 of applicant's remarks). The same argument is re-iterated at the last paragraph of page 7, the third full paragraph of page 8,

Art Unit: 2182

the first full paragraph of page 9, and again at the first full paragraph of page 10.

20. **As per argument 1, the Examiner disagrees.** It appears to the Examiner that the applicant is arguing that the special print server selects which document processing device is the most appropriate for the print job and transmits the print job to that document processing device which was selected by the special print server, and thus the document processing device is not predetermined. It is true that the special print server does have the functionality outlined by the applicant *supra*, however, *the selection of the document processor by the special printer server only occurs if the user does not specify a document processing device when creating the print job* (emphasis added). This is evidenced at column 5, lines 3-6, wherein Lahey teaches, "*In this way, the user may elect to not specify a printer in the network printing system 2 and let the spooler/scheduler 20 select an appropriate printer* 28,30,31, or 32," (emphasis added). Furthermore, Lahey teaches at column 8, lines 36-43, "*Fig. 5a shows a drop down menu for a Printer type 76 field in which the user can specify any printer or a specific printer* 28,30,31, or 32 *to print the Document 1* (emphasis added). At figure 10, item 86, Lahey teaches communicating the

Art Unit: 2182

location of the document data file, and at figures 4-6, Lahey further teaches communicating any other auxiliary information as well.

*Conclusion*

21. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eron J. Sorrell whose telephone number is 571 272-4160. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00AM - 5:30PM.

Art Unit: 2182

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A. Gaffin can be reached on 571 272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EJS  
April 21, 2005



JEFFREY GAFFIN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100